

**REMARKS**

Claims 67-76 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 1-66 without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 67-76 have been added. These new claims are supported by *at least* FIGS. 3 and 9 along with their corresponding description.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 14 is objected to due to minor informalities. Since claim 14 has been canceled, the rejection thereto is rendered moot.

***Claim Rejections***

Claims 25-26 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Satoshi Abe (JP 2001-273135; hereinafter “Abe”).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Hara (U.S. Publication No. 2003/00058086; hereinafter “Hara”). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Hara and further in view of Hamada et al. (JP 2002-163170; hereinafter “Hamada”). Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Hori et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0010467; hereinafter “Hori”). Claims 40, 42-44 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Yoshini et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0099663; hereinafter “Yoshini”) and further in view of Shozo Toritani (JP H11-284757; hereinafter “Toritani”). Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Yoshini in further view of Toritani and further in view of Hara. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Yoshini in further

view of Toritani and further in view of Isamu Iwamoto (JP 2002-024178; hereinafter “Iwamoto”). Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Yoshini in further view of Toritani and further in view of Hamada. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Yoshini in further view of Toritani and further in view of Candelore (U.S. Patent No. 7,120,250; hereinafter “Candelore”). Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Yoshini in further view of Toritani and further in view of Safadi (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0126086; hereinafter “Safadi”). Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Toritani in further view of Sochi (JP 2002-175084; hereinafter “Sochi”) and further in view of Burger (U.S. Publication No. 2007/0027696; hereinafter “Burger”). Claim 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Toritani in further view of Sochi further in view of Burger and further in view of Hara.

Since claims 14, 15, 25-30, and 40-55 have been canceled, these rejections are rendered moot.

### ***New Claims***

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 67-76 are patentable over the prior art of record. For example, claim 67 relates to an external device for executing content data based on information received from a mobile information terminal. The external device comprises, *inter alia*, content execution means. When a demand for executing the content data corresponding to a ticket acquired by said mobile information terminal from a ticket server storing the ticket necessary for executing said content data and information of a condition for utilizing and for executing said content data in said external device are received from said mobile information terminal, the content execution means communicates with a content server corresponding to an

address of said information of the condition for utilizing, acquires content data identified by a content ID included in said information of the condition for utilizing from said content server, and executes the acquired content data.

In view of this claimed configuration, only a user, e.g., who acquires a ticket using their mobile information terminal can execute content data in an external device. Moreover, when receiving a demand for executing the content data from mobile terminal, the external device acquires the content data from the content server based on the received information of the condition for utilizing, and thereafter, executes the acquired content data. The prior art of record does not teach or suggest these features. Moreover, an advantageous effect of the claimed configuration is that the load of the content server can be distributed. The prior art of record does not provide such an advantage.

Accordingly, claim 67 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 68-74 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 75 and 76 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 67. Therefore, claims 75 and 76 are patentable for *at least* reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 67.

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

/Quadeer A. Ahmed/  
Quadeer A. Ahmed  
Registration No. 60,835

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 14, 2009